Mitigation Subcommittee Meeting – November 6, 2001

State Reports
- Will be highlighted by specific state representatives during the Steering Committee Meeting on November 7, 2001

5-Year Program Reviewer Comments
- We can use or discard specific review suggestions
- Comments from reviewers other than Dennis Mileti were generally positive, they felt we met most of our goals except for the politically difficult ones such as building codes and land use
- Other reviewers felt we had done a lot with little funding
- Dennis Mileti had many suggestions for us as a mitigation expert, many of which reflect our own analysis of where our product "gaps" lie, especially with building codes and land use types of tools
- Overall he causes us to ask what tool will assist states to decide program effectiveness
- Other comments and suggestions include:
    - Involve the locals (we have attempted this in several ways including surveying local emergency managers, and some surveys of the general public within a given state)
    - Involve a social scientist in our group (we have some involved in our state agencies that we might use as resources, for example, assisting with a refining of our Implementation Plan)
    - Workshops for local users (we have had a couple of these at the multi-state level and plan at least 2 more in the next 5 years, states hold many local community workshops and meetings)
    - The Program is "out of balance" (we think this means that hardware has received more resources than mitigation)
- Reflections on reviewer comments include:
    - We need clear goals and performance measures to evaluate
    - Building codes vs. getting people of the low-lying area – what is more important? Or do these reflect long-term vs. short-term outcomes?
    - States/communities may face different factors, eg. Alaska doesn't have many beaches and needs building codes and land use guides, Washington needs vegetation guides
    - We did not know what the real cost of products (mitigation or mapping) would be when we were planning the program
    - We must use a team approach (at the fed/state/county/university level) to successfully address issues like building codes, and we must meet regularly (Hawaii's tsunami work group is a model)
    - Without a social scientist aboard, we sometimes make wrong assumptions about behavior, for example, that the public will panic in a crisis which the September 11 attack shows is not true and which is born out by some studies

Recommendations for Action
- Each state should have a Tsunami Advisor Process (this is officially designated in Hawaii and Washington, is done in practice in Alaska, but will never be official in other states due to lack of support at high state government levels. The Tsunami Advisor stays in contact with the Warning Centers and checks for their recommendations regarding a specific event.
- Identify where a social science community can advise us on the potential usefulness of our activities (providing feedback on our Activities Matrix, for example)
- Identify performance measures with help from a social scientist. This may need to be contracted.
- Develop tsunami chapter for the Coastal Construction Manual
- Develop a tsunami module for HAZUS (for example, by integrating tsunami into the Flood Information Tool, FIT)
- Integrate with other programs, for example, SeaGrant's Ports and Harbors project, the OSU giant wave tank which is looking for interested parties to run some experiments with the tank
- Establish clear cut outcomes that address "so what?", "what has changed as a result?"
- Integrate response/recovery with the Federal Response Plan, the Clearing House concept/role for NTHMP
- Ask the Post-tsunami Survey Team to consider including collection of certain types of data that the NTHMP is interested in (first must figure out what that is)
- Participate in regular tabletop tsunami exercises (the Tsunami Ready Communities are required to do this at least every two years)
- Re-invigorate the State and Local Tsunami Work Groups by meeting regularly and expanding the partnership to include new organizations
- Develop guidance for "all-clear" issues
  - Emergency managers need to know when the event is over from the warning centers
  - Emergency managers need guidance for deciding when it is all clear in their specific locale
- Make evacuation decision making more consistent among communities

Subcommittee Next 5 Years Framework Issues
- How do we add engineering resources?
  - Tim and Rich's workshop will consist of a small group of engineers from all 5 states and a Japanese representative to frame the research task ahead
  - Involve the Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI). Lori has been speaking with the Executive Director.
- What funding level do we need to plan for? Same or what we really need?
- Add new recommendation costs to the 5 Year Budget we generally crafted in Portland last May

FY 2002 Task Focus and Budget
- Maintain ongoing multi-state projects
  - Keep TsuInfo Alert project at $26K
  - Drop publication reprints this year, reinstall as need arises in future years
- New multi-state projects
  - Construction Design Workshop at $34K
  - No local workshop this year, reinstall as need arises in future years

Subtotal for Multi-state Projects   **$60K**

- State Programs this year increase to $64K each
  - Decrease in future years to fund more expensive phases of multi-state projects

Subtotal for State Programs   **$320K**

TOTAL   **$380K (post NOAA taxes)**

Work to be started next
- Prioritize recommendations for the next 5 Years and adjust the May 2001 version of the 5 Year Work Plan with these recommendations
- Assign costs to recommendations
- Assign a team and/or a lead
- Develop specific action items to follow through on recommendations
- Assign multi-year phases to action items
- Explore possible partners and other resources
- Report/discuss
  - during regular conference calls
  - use email and web tools to continue work and discussion on projects
  - continue to hold a second annual meeting to do substantial work on projects over a day or two days
  - perhaps with some work in concert with the Mapping Subcommittee where appropriate
- Refine/tweak the Implementation Plan and Activities Matrix by assigning work on different chapters/sections to different members or groups of members of the Subcommittee